

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/985,840	11/06/2001	Claude W. Light	9576 (3225-135)	4375		
26884	7590	09/10/2004	<table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>TRAN, QUOC A</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER	TRAN, QUOC A
EXAMINER						
TRAN, QUOC A						
PAUL W. MARTIN LAW DEPARTMENT, WHQ-4 1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD. DAYTON, OH 45479-0001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2176			

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/985,840	LIGHT, CLAUDE W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Quoc A. Tran	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application filed 11/06/2001.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 9, and 10 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10-11, 13-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Stone et al. US Pub No. 2002/0107889 A1 issued 08/08/2002 filed 02/08/2001 (hereinafter '889).**

In regard to dependent claim 1, "receiving report content in a markup language format; and generating a markup language format report by applying a stylesheet language format to the received report content", as taught by '889 at page 3, paragraph [0031] (i.e. The destination location 18 includes a report generator 38 that interfaces with the remote data access control facility 16 via the network 14. The destination

location 18 utilizes the communication link 13 to access the network 14 for communication with the remote data access control facility 16. The report generator 38 provides the destination location 18 with the capability to perform preferred data analytics on the data packaged by the originator location 12. The report generator 38 is capable of performing data analytics while the data is in a markup language format...), and also as taught by '889 at page 5, paragraph [0048] (i.e. ...the report generator organizational unit object 106 that defines one or more report templates without any parameters ...may contain one or more style sheets that define the viewing format of the analytic reports...).

In regard to dependent claim 2, "wherein the markup language format is XML based", as taught by '889 at page 3, paragraph [0031] (i.e. ...markup language format such as XML..).

In regard to dependent claim 4, "wherein the generated markup language format report is HTML-based", as taught by '889 at pages 3-4, paragraph [0031] (i.e. ... publish the analytic results in a pre-defined format such as, the hypertext markup language (HTML) format, or the Microsoft Excel format, or the like...).

In regard to dependent claim 5, "wherein the received report content is received from a web site", as taught by '889 at page 6, paragraph [0052] (i.e. ... the originator location 12 forwards the markup language document, via the network 14, to the web server 32 of the remote data access control facility 16...).

In regard to dependent claim 7, "wherein the received report content is received from a data store", as taught by '889 at page 6, paragraph [0021] (i.e. ... A

"destination" defines a business entity location where the transaction data is routed the communication network to perform data analytics. A destination location may be an originating business entity, or a recipient business entity, or a third party to the business transaction, such as a top tier supplier or the operator or the communication network....).

In regard to independent claim 10, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 11, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 13-14 consecutively, are directed to a system for performing the method of claims 4-5 consecutively, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 16, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 7, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 3, 6, 8-9, 12, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Stone et al. US Pub No. 2002/0107889 A1 issued 08/08/2002 filed 02/08/2001 (hereinafter '889), in view of Howard et al. US Patent No. 6,768,994 B1 issued 07/27/2004 filed 02/23/2001 (hereinafter '994).**

Claim 3 is representing claims 3, 6, 8;

In regard to dependent claim 3, '889 does not explicitly teach, "*The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the stylesheet language format is XSL based* ", however, as taught by '994 at col. 6, lines 15-20 (i.e..... The reported XML data may be re-formatted in XSL through the web browser for viewing on a web page...).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a feature, wherein the stylesheet language format is XSL based. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to generate reports, wherein the reports can be reformatted and customized using XSL stylesheets. With XSL, the user also can see the full report, hide pieces of information, switch between different views of the data such as text and charts, all without returning to the server for more information. As long as the data stay the same, stylesheets allow the user to reformat the display of that information on their computer, as taught by '994 at col. 5, lines 30-35 (i.e....advantage of the invention is that reports can be reformatted and customized using XSL stylesheets...).

In regard to dependent claim 6, "*wherein the generated markup language format report is generated at a receiving computer*", as taught by '994 at col. 5, lines 35-39 (i.e. allow the user to reformat the display of that information on their

computer. Further customization of the reports is available through a "My Reports" configuration...).

In regard to dependent claim 8, "wherein the received report content is received by a web browser", as taught by '994 at col. 6, lines 15-20 (i.e. ... The reported XML data may be re-formatted in XSL through the web browser for viewing on a web page...).

In regard to independent claim 9, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 12, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 15, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 6, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 17, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Boarg et al U.S. Patent No. 6,589,291 issued 07/08/2003 filed 04/08/1999
Mache et al U.S. Pub No. 2002/0035533A1 issued 03/21/2002 filed 12/21/2000

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8781, **"After mid-Oct, 2004, the examiner can be reach at (571) 272- 4103"**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
August 25, 2004



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER